

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/494,897	01/31/2000	Timothy E. Dickson	2400-384	4099
27820	7590 10/31/2003		EXAMINER	
WITHROW & TERRANOVA, P.L.L.C.			VON BUHR, MARIA N	
P.O. BOX 1287 CARY, NC 27512			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
<b>0</b> , 1.0		•	2125	1,[
			DATE MAILED: 10/31/2003	17

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•	/		$\alpha$
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/494,897	DICKSON, TIMOTH	Y E.
ŕ	Examiner /	Art Unit	
	Maria N. Von Buhr	2125	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence ado	lress
THE REPLY FILED FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPI Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to ave final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	) a timely filed amendment whicl	ation. A proper repl h places the applica	ition in
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Is ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH	g date of the final rejecti HE FINAL REJECTION.	on. See MPEP
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the under the un	If extension and the corresponding amo the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	unt of the fee. The apportunity of the feet of the final originally set in the final	ropriate extension Office action; or
<ol> <li>A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF</li> </ol>			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a)   they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or sir	mplifying the
(d)  they present additional claims without canceling	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claim	s.
NOTE:			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejecti	ion(s):		
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	be allowable if submitted in a se	parate, timely filed	amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See	reconsideration has been consi <u>e Continuation Sheet</u> .	dered but does NO	T place the
<ol> <li>The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.</li> </ol>	ause it is not directed SOLELY to	o issues which were	e newly
<ol> <li>For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims wo</li> </ol>	(s) a) will not be entered or b) old be rejected is provided belo	☐ will be entered a w or appended.	and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:		•	
Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is a	a)□ approved or b)□ disappi	roved by the Exami	ner.

Maria N. Von Buhr Primary Examiner Art Unit: 2125

10. Other: \_\_\_\_

9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.

Continuation of 5, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

As to the first point, that "the Myers et al. reference is commonly owned with the present application," the statement presented by Applicant is insufficient to overcome the rejection. This rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR §1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention "by another," or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR §1.131.

As to the second point, that "Myers et al. is not comparing fuel flow rates per se. Myers et al. is comparing a pulse stream indicative of a fuel flow rate or a number of pulses in a pulse stream. The pulse stream is not an amount of fuel alleged to be dispensed, but rather is a pulse stream. This pulse stream can be used to derive an amount of fuel alleged to be dispensed, but under the strict scutiny required in an anticipation analysis, the pulse stream is not an amount of fuel alleged to be dispensed," Applicant's argument is not persuasive. Upon further consideration, after the interview on 07 August 2003, as described in Paper No. 12, Examiner deems that the pulse stream of Myers et al. IS an amount of fuel alleged to be dispensed, albeit in a different unit of measure from customary gallons or liters. In this regard, Myers et al. specifically assert "generating a digital pulse stream INDICATIVE OF THE VOLUME AND FLOW RATE OF FUEL DISPENSED" (see at least the abstract; emphasis added). Hence, the rejection stands.